



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1420  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/821,848

03/29/2001

Toivo T. Kodas

41890-01350

3550

7590

01/02/2004

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP  
Suite 411  
3151 S. Vaughn Way  
Aurora, CO 80014

EXAMINER

TALBOT, BRIAN K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,848

Applicant(s)

KODAS ET AL.

Examiner

Brian K Talbot

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. The amendment filed 9/22/03 has been considered and entered. Claims 40-85 have been added. Claims 1-85 remain in the application.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. In light of the amendment filed 9/22/03, the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (5,985,356) in combination with O'Neill et al. (5,534,066).

Schultz et al. (5,985,356) teaches a process for depositing a plurality of reacted materials upon specific regions of a substrate and analyzing various properties of the deposited materials. The materials may be a variety of material and different compositions. The materials are synthesized and analyzed (see abstract and col. 3, line 10 – col. 4, line 59). A variety of properties can be analyzed (col. 8, lines 39-57). The components are reacted after deposition which includes heating (col. 9, lines 15-25). The screening techniques are various (col. 26, line 52 – col. 29, line 65).

Schultz et al. (5,985,356) fails to specifically teach a “real-time” monitoring of the system for changes in the composition of the reacted materials.

O'Neill et al. (5,534,066) teaches a fluid delivery apparatus having an infrared feedline sensor for sensing the concentration of a component of the feed gas. The sensing and monitoring is done continuously and in real-time (abstract and col. 1, lines 10-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Schultz et al. (5,985,356) process to incorporate "real-time" monitoring as evidenced by O'Neill et al. (5,534,066) with the expectation of achieving a more consistent final product as a result of tighter control of the process to avoid downtime or unacceptable results.

With respect to claims 6-9, 19-22, 27,28 and 35 Schultz et al. (5,985,356) is silent with regards to the various claimed depositing techniques.

While the Examiner acknowledges the fact that the prior is silent upon the claimed techniques, it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar results regardless of the depositing technique utilized. Furthermore, the prior art disclose numerous techniques which suggest to one skilled in the art that deposition technique is not critical to produce desired results.

### ***Double Patenting***

5. Claims 1-85 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5,13-15,18-21,24-27,31,40-43,64-67,75-77,80-83,86-89,93-95,103-105,108-111 and 114-117 of U.S. Patent No. 09/821,723.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

### ***Response to Amendment***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-85 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that the prior art failed to teach a "real-time" monitoring system.

O'Neill et al. (5,534,066) teaches the claimed limitations of a "real-time" monitoring system for controlling precursor gas compositions.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

Application/Control Number: 09/821,848

Page 5

Art Unit: 1762

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.



Brian K Talbot  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1762

BKT

December 11, 2003